and let the number increase to 45. There is clause 4 relating to the term of the office of Chairperson and members. The term up to two years would not be sufficient. It should at least be three years or more.

Clauses 15 and 16 are with regard to appointment of inspectors and visitors. Qualifications have not been mentioned and the report of the Visitor is to be treated as confidential. What is the need? If somebody is to be removed or if some institution is to be closed, such reports ought to be open administrative reports. Administratively such reports should be open and not confidential.

Clause 13 (3) provides for punishment. The punishment is imprisonment up to one year and a fine of Rs. 1000 and the complaint is to be filed by the authorised person of the Council. I would say that taking prior permission from the Central Government would not take less than two years. The limitation under the Code of Criminal Procedure is one year and if it takes two or three years to take permission, I think it will be barred by the law itself and it is not going to be helpful.

Similarly, clauses 29 and 30 also in which the Central Government is authorized to frame rules. At the same time, there is one exception to that also. If the rules are not considered to be laid before both the Houses of Parliament, then the particular administration would run without rules. I think that gives complete liberty to the bureaucrats and to the particular ruling party and will not help the handicapped and thus the whole purpose of bringing forth this Bill will be marred.

Anyway, despite the defects I support the Bill because it is one of the best measures which is needed and this is the first Bill of its kind which is introduced in the developing world. I, therefore, support the Bill. Thank you Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): The House stands adjourned for lunch and will reassemble at 2.30 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty-one minutes past one of the Clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-five minutes past two of the clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTI NATARAJAN) in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (RAILWAYS) 1992-93

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI MALLIKARJUN): Madam, I beg to lay on the Table a statement (in English and Hindi) showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants (Railways) for the year 1992-93.

THE REHABILITATION COUNCIL OF INDIA BILL, 1992—*Contd.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Now, we continue with the discussion on the Rehabilitation Council of India Bill, 1992. Shri Rajni Ranjan Sahu, do you want to say something on it?

SHRI RAJNI RANJAN SAHU (Bihar): Yes, Madam.

I rise to support the Bill. Many steps have been taken by the Ministry of Welfare to improve the lot of the downtrodden and depressed classes of society and hats off to the hon. Minister for his endeavour and achievements in a short span of his taking over as Minister of Welfare. This is a further step forward to recognise the Rehabilitation Council on the model of the Medical Council of India and statutory power is being conferred on this Council. It is highly appreciable that this Council